

PERFORMANCE AUDIT
OF THE
MUSKEGON CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

December 1998

EXECUTIVE DIGEST

MUSKEGON CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

INTRODUCTION	This report, issued in December 1998, contains the results of our performance audit* of the Muskegon Correctional Facility (MCF), Department of Corrections (DOC).
AUDIT PURPOSE	This performance audit was conducted as part of the constitutional responsibility of the Office of the Auditor General. Performance audits are conducted on a priority basis related to the potential for improving effectiveness* and efficiency*.
BACKGROUND	<p>MCF opened in 1974 and operates under the jurisdiction of DOC. The warden, appointed by the DOC director, serves as the chief administrative officer. MCF is a medium security prison (level 3), housing 1,310 male prisoners. MCF's mission* is to provide a safe, secure, and humane environment for both staff and prisoners.</p> <p>For fiscal year 1996-97, MCF reported operating expenditures of approximately \$22.2 million. As of June 30, 1998, MCF had 349 employees.</p>
AUDIT OBJECTIVES AND CONCLUSIONS	Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness of MCF's safety and security operations.

* See glossary on page 21 for definition.

Conclusion: We concluded that MCF's safety and security operations were generally effective. However, we noted reportable conditions* related to gate manifest* procedures, key and padlock controls, and cell searches* and prisoner shakedowns* (Findings 1 through 3).

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of MCF's prisoner care and facility maintenance operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that MCF's prisoner care and facility maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted a reportable condition related to cash receipts for prisoners (Finding 4).

**AUDIT SCOPE AND
METHODOLOGY**

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Muskegon Correctional Facility. Our audit was conducted in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included such tests of the records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

Our methodology included the testing of records primarily covering the period October 1, 1995 through June 30, 1998. We conducted a preliminary survey of MCF's operations. This included discussions with facility staff regarding their functions and responsibilities; tests of program records; and a review of DOC policy directives, DOC procedures, and MCF operating procedures to gain an understanding of facility activities and to form a basis for selecting certain operations for audit. We analyzed

* See glossary on page 21 for definition.

safety and security, prisoner care, and facility maintenance operations for compliance with applicable policies and procedures and overall program effectiveness.

Also, we surveyed certain area individuals and businesses requesting input regarding their association with MCF (see supplemental information).

AGENCY RESPONSES

Our audit report includes 4 findings and 4 corresponding recommendations. MCF agreed with all of the findings and informed us that it either has complied or will comply with the recommendations.

This page left intentionally blank.

Mr. Kenneth L. McGinnis, Director
Department of Corrections
Grandview Plaza
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mr. McGinnis:

This is our report on the performance audit of the Muskegon Correctional Facility, Department of Corrections.

This report contains our executive digest; description of agency; audit objectives, scope, and methodology and agency responses; comments, findings, recommendations, and agency preliminary responses; a description of survey and summary of survey responses, presented as supplemental information; and a glossary of acronyms and terms.

Our comments, findings, and recommendations are organized by audit objective. The agency preliminary responses were taken from the agency's responses subsequent to our audit fieldwork. The *Michigan Compiled Laws* and administrative procedures require that the audited agency develop a formal response within 60 days after release of the audit report.

We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to us during this audit.

Sincerely,

Thomas H. McTavish, C.P.A.
Auditor General

This page left intentionally blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MUSKEGON CORRECTIONAL FACILITY DEPARTMENT CORRECTIONS

INTRODUCTION

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Digest	1
Report Letter	5
Description of Agency	8
Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses	9

COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

Safety and Security Operations	11
1. Gate Manifest Procedures	11
2. Key and Padlock Controls	12
3. Cell Searches and Prisoner Shakedowns	13
Prisoner Care and Facility Maintenance Operations	15
4. Cash Receipts for Prisoners	15

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Survey	18
Summary of Survey Responses	19

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	21
--------------------------------	----

Description of Agency

The Muskegon Correctional Facility (MCF) opened in 1974 and operates under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections (DOC). The warden, appointed by the DOC director, serves as the chief administrative officer. MCF is a medium security facility (level 3) located in a heavily wooded section in the southeast corner of the City of Muskegon. MCF is double bunked and houses 1,310 male prisoners.

MCF's mission is to provide a safe, secure, and humane environment for both staff and prisoners. MCF became the first Michigan prison to become accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections in 1983. MCF was the first to become reaccredited in 1986 and received accreditation again in 1989, 1992, and 1995.

MCF provides a wide range of progressive academic programs, including special education, adult basic education, and general educational development (GED) completion. MCF also offers training programs in food preparation, auto mechanics, horticulture, and television production.

For fiscal year 1996-97, MCF reported operating expenditures of approximately \$22.2 million. As of June 30, 1998, MCF had 349 employees.

Audit Objectives, Scope, and Methodology and Agency Responses

Audit Objectives

Our performance audit of the Muskegon Correctional Facility (MCF), Department of Corrections (DOC), had the following objectives:

1. To assess the effectiveness of MCF's safety and security operations.
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of MCF's prisoner care and facility maintenance operations.

Audit Scope

Our audit scope was to examine the program and other records of the Muskegon Correctional Facility. Our audit was conducted in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included such tests of the records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

Audit Methodology

Our audit procedures were performed between April and July 1998 and included the testing of records primarily covering the period October 1, 1995 through June 30, 1998. We conducted a preliminary survey of MCF's operations. This included discussions with facility staff regarding their functions and responsibilities; tests of program records; and a review of DOC policy directives, DOC procedures, and MCF operating procedures to gain an understanding of facility activities and to form a basis for selecting certain operations for audit. In addition, we reviewed self audits performed by staff, monthly reports to the warden, monthly warden reports to the director, community liaison committee meeting minutes, and the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections evaluation reports. Also, we surveyed certain area individuals and businesses requesting input regarding their association with MCF (see supplemental information).

To assess the effectiveness of MCF's safety and security operations, we analyzed safety and security activities for compliance with applicable policies and procedures and

overall program effectiveness. We also conducted tests of records related to firearm inventories, firearm qualifications, searches of employees, key and padlock controls, gate manifests, visitor sign-in, and cell searches and prisoner shakedowns. On a test basis, we inventoried critical and dangerous tools.

To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of MCF's prisoner care and facility maintenance operations, we reviewed procedures and conducted tests of records related to fire safety activities, preventive maintenance programs, emergency electrical backup tests, and housekeeping and sanitation inspections. We also tested food service records and procedures related to Statewide menus, production, and quality evaluations. In addition, we analyzed prisoner store financial information and reviewed controls for prisoner funds and prisoner store operations.

Agency Responses

Our audit report includes 4 findings and 4 corresponding recommendations. MCF agreed with all of the findings and informed us that it either has complied or will comply with the recommendations.

The agency preliminary response which follows each recommendation in our report was taken from the agency's written comments and oral discussion subsequent to our audit fieldwork. Section 18.1462 of the *Michigan Compiled Laws* and Department of Management and Budget Administrative Guide procedure 1280.02 require DOC to develop a formal response to our audit findings and recommendations within 60 days after release of the audit report.

COMMENTS, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSES

SAFETY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS

COMMENT

Background: The Muskegon Correctional Facility (MCF) operates under the policy directives established by the Department of Corrections (DOC), as well as MCF operating procedures, which are developed internally. The security perimeter is protected by three electronically monitored chain link fences and is patrolled by response vehicles. Procedures have been implemented to ensure the security of tools, keys, and firearms. MCF staff conduct periodic searches of prisoners, prison cells, and MCF employees for contraband*. Visitors entering the facility must go through a metal detector and are subject to search by MCF staff.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness of MCF's safety and security operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that MCF's safety and security operations were generally effective. However, we noted reportable conditions related to gate manifest procedures, key and padlock controls, and cell searches and prisoner shakedowns.

FINDING

1. Gate Manifest Procedures

MCF did not effectively monitor gate manifests to help ensure the safe movement of critical and dangerous items into and out of the facility.

DOC operating procedures require that a list of authorized employees be kept at the gate and that the list be revised annually and when necessary. MCF operating procedures also require gate manifests to include a complete description of items transported, an authorized approval, an inspection by a gate officer, and a verification of items returned through the gate.

* See glossary on page 21 for definition.

Our review of 301 gate manifests for the month of February 1998 disclosed:

- a. The proper authorization was missing on 11 (4%) gate manifests.
- b. The name of the person requesting the movement of items was missing on 91 (30%) gate manifests.
- c. The name of the person transporting items was missing on 140 (47%) gate manifests.
- d. The gate officer's signature was missing on 25 (8%) gate manifests.
- e. The indication of whether dangerous or critical items were removed from the facility was missing on 170 (56%) gate manifests.
- f. The date that dangerous or critical tools were removed from the facility was missing on 92 (31%) gate manifests.

Failure to monitor gate manifests weakens accountability and could result in critical and dangerous items being left inside the facility.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that MCF monitor gate manifests to help ensure the safe movement of critical and dangerous items into and out of the facility.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

MCF agreed with the recommendation. MCF will revise its procedure to require that all items are properly approved and processed.

FINDING

2. Key and Padlock Controls

MCF did not ensure the accountability for securing and issuing keys and padlocks.

DOC policy directives and MCF operating procedures require that pharmacy keys be classified as high security and that key and padlock inventories be taken twice a year to verify the accuracy of the inventory records.

Our review of key and padlock controls disclosed the following deficiencies:

- a. Keys to the pharmaceutical dispensing room were not classified as high security keys as required by DOC procedures. The keys were classified at a lower security level allowing persons other than health care workers access to the room.
- b. Padlock inventory records were not accurate. The padlock locations were not listed correctly, 2 padlocks were issued with the same number and 4 spare padlocks were found in a classroom desk drawer.

Proper key and padlock controls help increase accountability for facility keys and help ensure that only authorized employees have access to secured areas.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that MCF enforce existing procedures and controls and ensure the accountability for securing and issuing keys and padlocks.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

MCF agreed with the recommendation. MCF will classify pharmaceutical dispensing room keys as high security and remove keys from nonlicensed health care staff key rings. Also, MCF will account for padlocks by area supervisor rather than by location.

FINDING

3. Cell Searches and Prisoner Shakedowns

MCF did not implement monitoring procedures to help ensure that officers complete the required cell searches or prisoner shakedowns.

MCF required some officers to work dual positions in the housing units. These dual positions consisted of resident unit officers* working in a custody position and custody officers* working in a housing position. MCF procedures required officers to complete 3 cell searches or 5 prisoner shakedowns each shift.

Our review of officers working in the dual positions noted that only 70% of the officers completed the required number of cell searches or prisoner shakedowns for the period April 15 through April 30, 1998. In contrast, officers not working the dual positions completed approximately 93% of the required cell searches and prisoner shakedowns.

Cell searches and prisoner shakedowns help detect whether prisoners possess or use contraband so that the contraband can be confiscated.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that MCF implement monitoring procedures to help ensure that officers complete the required cell searches or prisoner shakedowns.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

MCF agreed and informed us that it has complied with the recommendation. Resident unit managers or assistants will ensure that housing unit relief officers perform the required number of cell searches. MCF also informed us that it developed a computer system to track daily shakedowns by nonhousing custody officers. Information is compared with daily staffing sheets and shift commanders are advised of any nonhousing custody officers who did not meet the required number of shakedowns per day so that shift commanders can take appropriate corrective action.

* See glossary on page 21 for definition.

PRISONER CARE AND FACILITY MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS

COMMENT

Background: MCF has developed procedures for prisoner care and facility maintenance operations. These operations include prisoner store and benefit fund operations, preventive maintenance activities, periodic housekeeping and sanitation inspections, warehouse operations, food service activities, prisoner accounting, routine fire safety, and community liaison committee activities.

Audit Objective: To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of MCF's prisoner care and facility maintenance operations.

Conclusion: We concluded that MCF's prisoner care and facility maintenance operations were generally effective and efficient. However, we noted a reportable condition related to cash receipts for prisoners.

FINDING

4. Cash Receipts for Prisoners

MCF did not have sufficient controls over cash items received for prisoners through the mail and at the front gate drop box. We noted the following deficiencies related to MCF's cash item receiving processes:

- a. MCF did not immediately prepare receipts or make log entries for some cash items (check, money order, or cash) received for prisoners by mail. MCF did not process questionable cash items received for prisoners, such as cash items from unidentified sources or cash items thought to be from the family of other prisoners, until MCF determined the propriety of its disposition through the hearing process. This delayed the recording of these items by approximately seven days. During this period, MCF stored the cash in a file cabinet and did not maintain a record of the cash items on hand. Therefore, MCF could not readily detect an error or irregularity if one occurred.

MCF operating procedures and Department of Management and Budget Administrative Guide procedures require that mail openers prepare a cash receipt log. The log must contain the date received, type of money (check,

money order, or cash) received, amount received, initials of mail openers (minimum of two), and initials of cashier acknowledging verification of count and transfer from mail openers.

- b. The recipient of cash items received for prisoners at the front gate drop box also prepares the deposit slip. This arrangement provides opportunity for errors or irregularities to occur and not be detected in a timely manner.

MCF operating procedures and Department of Management and Budget Administrative Guide require a separation in the duties of receiving cash items and preparing the deposit slip.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that MCF establish sufficient controls, including the enforcement of existing procedures, over cash items received for prisoners through the mail and at the front gate drop box.

AGENCY PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

MCF agreed and informed us that it has complied with the recommendation by compiling a daily log for all cash items received in the mailroom and by assigning two staff members to open and verify cash items received at the front gate drop box.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Description of Survey

We developed a survey requesting input from certain area individuals and businesses regarding their association with the Muskegon Correctional Facility.

We mailed this survey to 47 individuals and businesses and received 15 responses. A review of the responses indicated that nearly half of the respondents who had an opinion were either highly or somewhat satisfied with the facility administration and that their concerns were addressed in a timely manner. However, some responses indicated a need to notify the community of any problems or emergency situations related to the facility. We provided a summary of this information to the warden.

MUSKEGON CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

Department of Corrections

Summary of Survey Responses

Copies of Survey Distributed	47
Number of Responses	15
Response Rate	31.9%

The total number of responses for each item may not agree with the number of responses reported above because some respondents did not answer all questions.

1. How would you rate your satisfaction with the frequency of contacts between you/your organization and Muskegon Correctional Facility?

Highly <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	No <u>Opinion</u>
2	4	1	3	5

2. How satisfied are you with how management of the Muskegon Correctional Facility has addressed your individual concerns?

Highly <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	No <u>Opinion</u>
3	3	3	2	4

3. How satisfied are you with the timeliness in which your individual concerns are addressed by the Muskegon Correctional Facility?

Highly <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	No <u>Opinion</u>
2	4	0	3	6

4. How satisfied are you with the Muskegon Correctional Facility's process to notify the community of any problems or emergency situations related to the facility?

Highly <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	No <u>Opinion</u>
2	4	3	3	2

5. Do you have any specific safety or security concerns that have not been addressed by facility personnel?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
2	13

6. If you had an occasion to visit the facility, were you satisfied with the security provided to you while at the facility?

Highly <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	No <u>Opinion</u>
2	3	0	1	7

7. Overall, how satisfied are you with the extent of communication between the facility and the community?

Highly <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Satisfied</u>	Somewhat <u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	No <u>Opinion</u>
3	4	2	3	3

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

cell search	The act of going through a prisoner's cell and belongings looking for contraband.
contraband	Property which is not allowed on facility grounds or in visiting rooms by State law, rule, or DOC policy. For prisoners, this includes any property which they are not specifically authorized to possess, authorized property in excessive amounts, or authorized property which has been altered without permission.
custody officers	Corrections officers who do not work in a housing unit. These officers are assigned to the prison yard, school, control center, visiting room, bubble (central point of entry into and exit out of the facility), etc.
DOC	Department of Corrections.
effectiveness	Program success in achieving mission and goals.
efficiency	Achieving the most outputs and outcomes practical for the amount of resources applied or minimizing the amount of resources required to attain a certain level of outputs or outcomes.
gate manifest	A record used to control materials and supplies transported in and out of the facility.
MCF	Muskegon Correctional Facility.
mission	The agency's main purpose or the reason the agency was established.

performance audit	An economy and efficiency audit or a program audit that is designed to provide an independent assessment of the performance of a governmental entity, program, activity, or function to improve public accountability and to facilitate decision making by parties responsible for overseeing or initiating corrective action.
reportable condition	A matter coming to the auditor's attention that, in his/her judgment, should be communicated because it represents either an opportunity for improvement or a significant deficiency in management's ability to operate a program in an effective and efficient manner.
resident unit officers	Corrections officers who work in the housing units.
shakedown	The act of searching a prisoner, an employee, or a visitor to ensure that he/she does not have any contraband in his/her possession.